2 --000--

3 (In open court.)

THE CLERK: Calling case number 21-MJ-007; United States versus Gary Stephen Maynard. This is on calendar for motion for bail review, your Honor.

THE COURT: Appearances, please.

MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Michael Anderson on behalf of the United States, and the government agrees to proceed via Zoom.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Anderson.

MS. LABAREE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Hannah Labaree for Mr. Maynard. He is appearing by video teleconference from the Sacramento County Jail. He does consent to appear by Zoom today.

I would ask for a few minutes in a breakout room to review the contents of the Pretrial report.

THE COURT: Okay. I will give you that, and I would make one comment before you do that so that this can be something you discuss.

One of the concerns that I have is the discrepancy between the defense proffer and the Pretrial Services report about the availability of family support for paying rent. The defendant doesn't seem to have income, and the board and care residential proposal is not free. So I'm going to ask counsel to address

1 | that when we're back.

Let's take a five-minute recess and put Ms. Labaree and Mr. Maynard into a breakout room. Thank you, everyone.

(Recess taken, 2:24 to 2:31 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. We are back on the record.

THE CLERK: Would you like the matter recalled?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

THE CLERK: Calling 21-MJ-007; United States versus Gary Stephen Maynard. This is on calendar for motion for bail review, your Honor.

11 THE COURT: All right. Hello, Mr. Anderson,
12 Ms. Labaree, and Mr. Maynard.

Ms. Labaree, do you want to proceed today or where are you?

MS. LABAREE: We do want to proceed. I think the specific issue you had raised before I went into the breakout room has been resolved.

It became -- it came to my attention just before court, and I believe Officer Walker has reached back out to Mr. Maynard's father to clarify, so perhaps we can get it from him.

THE COURT: Let's just pause for me to specify that I have read the detention memo that was submitted, not for purposes of today, but the first time around -- just to get a sense of the government's concerns -- the defendant's motion for bail review, the original report and the supplemental report.

Mr. Walker recommends against release. And what is proposed by the defense is Mr. Maynard's release to a board and care facility that they have located in South Sacramento where a room is being held for him, and my concern was about whether he actually knew that this was going to work out or not.

Mr. Walker, do you have an update for me?

PRETRIAL SERVICES: Yes. The only update I have is that I did speak with defendant's father, and he did indicate that he would be willing to pay the rent until Mr. Maynard could pay the rent on his own.

THE COURT: Okay. So the proposal made by the defense is available, and I'll hear from both sides and let you argue. I want to start just by saying, so you both have some idea of how I'm looking at this. You know, there's a package that's been proposed that's new information sufficient to reopen, as far as I'm concerned.

I share every one of the government's danger concerns, and legally I agree with Ms. Labaree because the offense charged here is not one specified in (f)(1). Detention is only on the table as an option if there -- if the government can establish a serious risk of flight, something more than the risk of flight that's always present when someone is being charged.

So, actually, I'd like Mr. Anderson to start with that, and the things that strike me as being the most significant flight risk factors in this case are the defendant's lack of

significant ties to this community and his peripatetic history,
which Ms. Labaree has a completely plausible explanation for
given the academic job market, I find that entirely
unsurprising, but I also understand why it raises arguably more
than the typical flight risk concerns.

But what makes this a serious flight risk and why aren't concerns based just on those factors merely speculative? Is there anything in particular here that indicates that this defendant has demonstrated some intent to flee?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor, thank you. So this -- this case raises really particular dangerousness and flight risk concerns, and unusually they're woven together a little bit. So part of what makes this case and this defendant so dangerous is the type of offense he's committing and also the way that he's committing it.

THE COURT: I really do want -- I'm sorry to interrupt you.

MR. ANDERSON: I will link it.

THE COURT: I need to know why this is a serious flight risk case such as I ask the question, are there conditions sufficient to contain danger? And the dangerousness of the offense conduct is perfectly obvious to me.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, absolutely, and I'm trying to answer your question, your Honor. I'm sorry I'm kind of winding to it. But the way that he commits this offense

through movement around the state, across huge geographic areas, he was very, very mobile. And mobile in a way that was consistent with someone who is being motivated by things that are different than what's motivating a lot of the people that come before the Court.

This isn't an arson for profit; this is an arson for revenge. This is somebody who's driven by some other type of instinct or force or desire to commit these arsons. And, as a result, he is driving hours and hours through the day and night, as is reflected in the complaint affidavit, in order to move from one location to the other side of California, another location, in this very, very unstable way that's consistent with somebody who is just not going to be reliable for appearing in a court or even staying within the district, let alone staying where he can be monitored. And I know I'm touching on the dangerousness issue you don't want to get to yet, but then it leads into that other issue.

He just has no -- it's not just an instability in the job market -- which frankly is kind of understandable in that career field at this time -- this is an instability that goes so much deeper into the way that he's functioning and interacting with the world. There's just nothing that's tying him down to the district, and there's, frankly, nothing that was even tying him to a specific location for more than, you know, a day or two. Even hour to hour, this is somebody who is

on the move, who is being driven to go places, and,
unfortunately, ultimately, commit arson in these locations in a
very, very, dangerous way. But he's simply not somebody who
can be addressed, as far as I can see from the record, in the
way that we would try to address the flight risk concerns with
many of the defendants that come before the Court. This is a
very different and much more unusual situation.

THE COURT: Thank you. I understand that argument, and I think it's a strong one.

So, Ms. Labaree, setting aside any implications, I think any of us would just be speculating right now about forces that motivate the alleged offense conduct.

But simply given the pattern of movement involved in the offense conduct, I understand your client doesn't have a car anymore. But, even so, why doesn't that pattern itself demonstrate a serious flight risk in the first instance, and secondarily one that I can't reasonably expect would be contained by releasing him to a board and care facility?

MS. LABAREE: Well, I think the first thing is that simply the movement around this state does not equal flight risk. In other words, Mr. Maynard -- the question for this Court is twofold. It's whether a serious risk of flight, in other words, is he going to flee from these charges? And the other one is, is there a risk of his nonappearance in court?

The fact that he was somewhat itinerant in the month and a

half leading up to his arrest in this case simply does not equate with a serious risk that he's not going to be able to get it together to be in court in front of federal proceedings.

He has absolutely no history of that, and he has a very minor criminal history dating to 20 plus years ago, so to the degree that we know anything about his court appearances, you know, that that's the data we have.

Beyond that, I think, you know, this is -- this is not somebody with a lot of financial resources. I think that's abundantly clear from the amount of work I've had to do to put together a bond package and find suitable housing for him.

As this Court noted, the car, which was the source of his mobility, has been seized by the government as evidence in this case; he cannot buy a new one. Any speculation as to whether he will have access to another vehicle is just speculation.

He specifically requested that he be housed in Sacramento so that he would have access to the court and to the Federal Defender's Office. And we found him a place that is close to -- or fairly close, it looks like sort of a hike -- but to the light rail so he has a direct line to downtown Sacramento.

So this bond package is specifically designed to consider how do we route this person in the exact district, and even close to the venue within the district that his charges are out of.

But that being said also, clearly there are additional

conditions available to this Court to impose that can even more firmly tether him and tether him to potential violations such as curfew, ankle monitoring, even to home detention if this Court is so inclined to do that.

And I think I did put in my motion the conversation with the owner of the room and board. I did make clear what the charges were in this case because I didn't want it to come back around on us that this wasn't an acceptable release location, and she's aware of that.

THE COURT: Mr. Walker, when you wrote the report, you had not heard back from the board and care operator. Do you have any information about any possible limitations on your ability to do location monitoring at that location should I grant --

PRETRIAL SERVICES: I don't have any information on that because I haven't spoken with her.

THE COURT: Ms. Labaree, have you or your social work team directly discussed the requirements of the location monitoring program, which I know you're familiar with, with the operator?

MS. LABAREE: In my brief conversation with the owner, I did mention that we're awaiting to hear what conditions were going to be imposed, and that location monitoring might be one of them.

So again, just like the nature of the charges in this case,

1 | that did not deter the offer of an open room.

2 THE COURT: And my memory is failing me a little bit.
3 Usually are the questions related to the availability of
4 location monitoring dependent on there being a landline?

Mr. Walker, can you tell me what the --

PRETRIAL SERVICES: A landline is not required. We have technology. Yeah.

THE COURT: All right.

I am seriously considering a \$25,000 appearance bond to be cosigned by the father with location monitoring and home detention at the board and care facility.

I think it is a very close call, and under the statutes very close calls need to be resolved in favor of the defendant. It seems to me that if he is subject to Pretrial Services supervision with a mental health condition, an ankle monitor, and home detention, the restrictions on his ability to flee or to pose any danger to the community with additional conduct would be adequately contained. We'd also, of course, need a condition barring him from any national or state forest or other public lands, all public lands, BLM, I think most of them are closed right now given the fire situation.

Mr. Anderson, I know you object to this. But what other -if I'm going to do it, what other conditions, because I want to
put it all on the table, and then we'll take a five-minute
recess so Mr. Walker can draft something in email to all of us.

```
What other conditions would you insist on while reserving your objections to the very concept?
```

MR. ANDERSON: May I make the objections and attempt to change your mind first, your Honor, and then --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ANDERSON: So, your Honor, taking some comfort in the idea of ankle monitoring, and I want to say that in this case that's a condition that is not nearly as helpful as in most cases. And, in fact, the actual facts in this case show that.

We had a monitor on the defendant's car for a period of time, and he disappeared. And even with the devoting a substantial amount of law enforcement resources to tracking him and the existence of the tracker, he still was able to disappear and still was able to commit additional arsons that placed firefighters at risk.

THE COURT: But did he know -- he didn't know there was a tracker on his car. This was part of the investigation, correct?

MR. ANDERSON: He didn't, your Honor, but if he were to remove this tracker, as people do when they know that they exist and that happens, he would disappear, and he would disappear long enough potentially to -- I don't want to overstate this, your Honor, because I don't want to look like -- but the danger in this case is so, so substantial.

Entire communities have burned this year, we're in the midst of just an exceptionally dangerous fire season. We have been fortunate that there have been few, if any, deaths this year.

But we know from prior years just how dangerous these fires are.

The ankle monitor just doesn't do the work in this case -although it is better than nothing, it absolutely does not do
the work in this case that it does in other cases where we
think, "Okay, well, if somebody starts to flee, they'll cut the
ankle monitor, and that will give us time to catch them before
they get an international flight or before they cross the
border into Mexico."

Here that's not the concern. Here the concern is he cuts the ankle monitor and disappears, and it takes five days or a week or two weeks to find him. And in the course of that time period there's been, you know, devastation that's been racked on the community as a result of that. So that's my concern with the ankle monitor. It just doesn't do what we hope it does.

The bond package -- again, a bond is better than no bond.

But here a bond package is usually a means of convincing a

person not to flee because they don't want to damage the loved

ones or others around them. But we're still, and I realize it

is speculation to think about why he's committing these crimes,

but it is very likely, given the way that they're being

committed and what he's doing, that it's not the subject of a process that we can say, "Well, there's a \$25,000 bond, and you don't want to lose that bond or put your family at risk for losing that \$25,000; therefore, he's going to stay."

It's not the type of thing where you can influence him as easily as you could in one of our fraud cases, or in, you know, even a guy in a drug case, often you can find a package that really works using a bond. And this just isn't that type of case.

So doing my best to try to get -- I've always appreciated, your Honor, you're willing to listen and think through what we're arguing, even if you're headed in a different direction, but I'm really trying to do my best to try to convince you.

THE COURT: And you're being very persuasive.

Although, I do think that there's a certain amount of speculation about what is going on with this defendant psychologically, and I have great concerns about that. I just don't think I have any information, you know, on which to base accepting the things that you are implying or assuring myself that I don't need to worry about them, right?

When it comes to the bond, my concern, actually, is that he does not appear to have a close relationship with his father, that's very clear. So the one family member who has offered to cosign an unsecured bond is not someone who I can count on Mr. Maynard to care about sufficiently, that he would be

motivated to make his appearances by desire not to harm the father.

Ms. Labaree, I don't mean to put you on the spot with this one, but I know that there are also some siblings. Is there any reason to think that additional time to reach out to them might come up with additional sureties, maybe even some property, or are you just going to rest on what you've got in terms of family?

MS. LABAREE: Your Honor, I do not believe that additional time would yield more sureties. We've worked on this case, and I've spoken to his -- I've spoken to his dad multiple times a week since Mr. Maynard was charged. He's extremely concerned about his son, and, you know, I don't -- these are not people who have dinner every Sunday night, and Mr. Maynard is a grown man and doesn't have a super close relationship with his family in the sense of talking often, but he certainly would not run out on his father for \$25,000. He is very aware of his dad's retiree status and is very concerned about his dad. If I could, if there are other of

THE COURT: I'm not sure he was done, so let me make sure that Mr. Anderson is able to make every argument he wanted to make to talk me out of where I might have been headed, and then I'll respond to all of them.

MR. ANDERSON: So the overall argument is just this

isn't a case where these types of conditions accomplish what we're hoping to accomplish. And as far as the concern about are we speculating about his motivations or why he's doing what he's doing, I think it's beyond speculation.

And the reason it's beyond speculation is because we have a lot of evidence collected about the conduct that he actually — he did, and it varies so dramatically from other cases where there's another motive. And I mentioned before a profit motive — we see that in arson cases in federal court — and sometimes those individuals are suitable for release. We can get packages together that make sense for them.

Sometimes we see sort of a revenge or a

I-don't-like-my-employer type of motive, and you can start to
think about how you can create conditions that make it so that
that person is less dangerous.

Here we're in a situation where the only motive that's really left is that he has a desire to commit these arsons. And he's a smart guy, clearly, very knowledgeable, and he committed them in a particularly dangerous way.

I mean, this is an insanely dangerous crime, but he did it in a way that was -- could not have been better plotted in order to trap firefighters between the existing Dixie Fire and the fires that Mr. Maynard was setting.

But for the Forest Service working so hard and monitoring him, and the monitor on his vehicle and his phone and them

being nearby, those fires very well could have spread, and we could be talking about dead firefighters rather than talking about a fire source stopped.

THE COURT: And when -- I don't disagree with you about the inference that those facts supports about a likely motive for committing the crimes.

Where I'm pointing out, I think perhaps a leap too far in terms of inferences, is to say, therefore, this is a defendant who suffers from such a compulsion that he would not be constrained having been criminally charged, having been arrested and jailed, that he would be unable to control himself and comply with conditions of release even when on Pretrial Services supervision, on home detention, and with an ankle monitor, banned from public lands. That's where I don't know that there is factual support.

MR. ANDERSON: I think that's a good point to raise, and I'm glad the Court is bringing that up. Because it is hard to know exactly how he would react to these situations, but we do have a few pieces of knowledge. We know that he's had a lot of instability in his life with jobs and moving around. We also know that when arrested, he threatened the law enforcement officers that he would kill them.

THE DEFENDANT: (Inaudible.)

MR. ANDERSON: So we know there's some --

THE COURT: See, Mr. Maynard, let your lawyer speak

```
for you. Mr. Anderson is telling me what he thinks the facts
 1
     will show. I take everything both sides tell me with a grain
 2
     of salt. Sit tight. Mr. Anderson will make his argument.
 3
         Go ahead, Mr. Anderson.
               MR. ANDERSON: And this is a proffer based on the
 5
 6
     facts that were set forth in the Pretrial Services report and
 7
     also the criminal complaint.
         And given those -- those facts, those give us a weight on
 8
     the scale on the side of saying, "This is somebody who is going
 9
10
     to have a lot of difficulty under Pretrial supervision."
         On the other side of the scale, we haven't really seen
11
     anything yet, except for a hope that generally somebody would
12
13
     not leave their parents in a situation where they're losing
     $25,000.
14
         So we're almost speculating on the other side against these
15
16
     facts that we have developed in the case to say, "Well, usually
17
     people act in a certain way." It's really not clear that
18
     that's going to happen in this case because of everything we've
19
     seen so far, the facts we do have saying that he's not going to
20
     act the way that we usually expect people to act.
               THE COURT: And there's a statutory presumption for
21
22
     release, not detention?
               MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.
23
24
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Labaree?
```

MS. LABAREE: So I want to go back to the ankle

25

monitor issue. I don't have a super extensive counterargument here because I think a lot of the points can be sort of collapsed into a few.

In terms of the ability of ankle monitor to track somebody, we rely on that often in Pretrial Services situations with people who have a track record of failing to appear, with people who have a long criminal history of -- of offenses ranging from those that are violent to those that are theft-based, and, you know, motivated by greed or motivated by poverty.

There's all sorts of very strong motivations that might compel somebody to commit a violation of pretrial release, including the desire to flee from a ten-year mandatory minimum, for example, where we do find that ankle monitor is sufficient. Because what it does is it puts a short leash, so to speak, on somebody, such that the very capable Pretrial Services officers will get an immediate notification if their person is on home detention, which as we know is the highest form of this, and we do rely on those mechanisms all the time in this court.

I understand the fear that this Court, and certainly the prosecutor, is talking about in terms of what if the worst-case-possible scenario happens here? That Mr. Maynard is guilty as charged, which is, of course, unproven. And that his, as the speculation goes, his compulsion is so strong that he's not going to care about the ankle monitor, he's going to

be overcome.

I just think these things are ultimately speculative, and those worse-case scenarios are what this Court would have to find to be so convincing that it would outweigh the use of ankle monitor and these other tools we have.

You know, I will go back to the fact that this man doesn't have a car. So in terms of some -- just the practical reality of what his mobility will be, it's severely shortened from the original sort of tether that he had.

And, you know, I also think that one of the 3142(g) factors is to look at this person's particular characteristics, and one of those is whether he's been on pretrial or whether he was on parole, probation, some type of court release. And one of the questions you asked there -- and I know because I'm on the other side of the argument often -- is if he's alleged to have committed this instant offense while under supervision, under another court system or this court system, why would we believe that there's anything we can do to be sure that he will comply with the conditions of release.

And in this case we just have absolutely no information that he would, aside from the speculation of the fear.

So I think that, legally speaking, that the correct result here, and honestly the just result for this particular person who I do have every faith is going to comply, is for release under these strict conditions.

THE COURT: Submitted, Mr. Anderson?

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I'd ask that we, if possible, hear from Pretrial Services about how quickly they could realistically react to somebody cutting an ankle monitor.

My experience -- and we have had numerous people flee in this district -- is that it's not happening quite as fast as

Ms. Labaree is suggesting.

THE COURT: But someone -- I had an after-hours duty call this week because Pretrial was aware that an ankle monitor had, in fact, been cut. They figured that out pretty quickly; I signed a warrant. How long it takes to locate that person?

Look, in any -- any case there is a chance that someone is going to skip town. Sometimes those people are caught right

But that possibility which exists in every case does not drive the detention or release calculus. And I am very aware that the stakes are high in this case because of the dangerousness of the charged conduct -- the charged offense conduct.

away, sometimes it takes a long time to find them.

Mr. Anderson is quite right to worry that if this were to turn out to be among that very small -- very, very small percentage of cases in which someone released actually does flee, that the consequences could be grave. But that's also not the question.

The question is whether there are proposed conditions that

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- reasonably assure appearance and safety, and I think -- I think that if this defendant is monitored and his ability to travel 2 is slim to none, could he theoretically skip town and go commit 3 more arsons? Of course he could, but that is not the question. Is that likely to happen? I think not. 5
 - So I'm going to grant the motion. I see Mr. -- I was just about to ask Mr. Walker for some amendments to what he earlier sent me, but he's already gotten me something, which is good. Home detention, that's good, mental health, good. Barred on public lands.
 - Mr. Walker, did you also send this to both counsel? PRETRIAL SERVICES: Yes, I did.
 - THE COURT: Okay, great. So everyone should have in their email inbox conditions, and I'm doing this over the objection of the government and against the recommendation of Pretrial Services.
 - And before I even go there, Mr. Maynard, I'm going to address you directly.
 - The law requires me to come up, in most cases, with conditions of release that are sufficient to make sure the defendant comes to court and doesn't commit any other crimes while the case is going on. And only in the rare case when nothing short of jail is sufficient to do that, can I leave someone in custody in a case like yours.
 - I can't make the finding that having you on home detention

is so much riskier than jail, that it's not good enough. But you need to know a few things.

I'm going to order you released based upon a bond -- you don't get released until Monday, in any case -- but when you do, it will be on a basis of a bond that you and your father cosigned, which means if you do try to escape responsibility for this case and just disappear, your father is going to end up owing the United States of America \$25,000.

Also, should you commit any other crimes while on pretrial release, fail to appear for court while on pretrial release, or violate any of the conditions of your supervision, including the home detention, any of them, it is possible that a warrant could go out for your arrest, and you could go back to jail for the pendency of this case.

Given all of the factors that Mr. Walker and Mr. Anderson have been emphasizing to me today, I can predict with a fair amount of confidence that any messing up on pretrial supervision is not going to get you a second chance. Because everyone is very, very, very worried about you and about this case, and I want to make that very clear.

So having -- having given you that lecture, I'm going to order your release based on a \$25,000 unsecured bond to be cosigned by your father, Gary Maynard. You are ordered to obey all laws, make all your court appearances, and you will be subject to Pretrial Services supervision under the following

special conditions of release. 1

> You must report to and comply with all rules and regulations of the Pretrial Services agency. Your release will be delayed until Monday, the 13th, at 9:00 a.m. As soon as you are released, you must report directly to Pretrial Services, which is on the fifth floor of the federal courthouse building.

You must reside at --

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRETRIAL SERVICES: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

PRETRIAL SERVICES: We're on the second floor.

THE COURT: I said fifth floor; that's the marshals.

He does not need to go to the marshals, he needs to go to 12

Pretrial Services, thank you, on the second floor. 13

You must cooperate with the collection of a DNA sample. Your travel is restricted to the Eastern District of California unless otherwise approved in advance by your Pretrial Services officer.

You must surrender your passport to the Clerk of Court and not apply for or obtain any passport or travel documents during the pendency of this case. If you are unable to locate your passport, you need to file a Declaration of Lost Passport before September 17th.

You must not possess, have in your residence, or have access to a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or dangerous weapon, and must provide written proof of divestment 1 of any such items under your control.

You must refrain from the excessive use of alcohol or any use of a narcotic drug or controlled substance without a prescription from a licensed medical practitioner.

You must notify your Pretrial Services officer immediately of any prescribed medications. And you may not use marijuana, even for medical reasons, even if it's prescribed by a doctor, whether or not it's legal in California.

You must submit to drug and alcohol testing as directed by your Pretrial Services officer, and pay for those services based on your ability to pay as determined by the Pretrial Services officer.

You must report any contact with law enforcement to your Pretrial Services within 24 hours. You must participate in the following location monitoring program component and abide by all of the -- sorry, I lost where I was.

You'll have a location monitoring unit installed in your residence and a radiofrequency transmitter device attached to your person. You have to comply with all the requirements of the program and all instructions related to the equipment that's given to you by Pretrial Services or the monitoring company. You will also pay for that based on your ability to pay as determined by Pretrial Services.

You will be on home detention until further order of the Court. That means you must remain inside the board and care

```
facility at all times except for employment, religious
1
    services, medical, substance abuse, or mental health treatment.
2
    This is with your attorney, court appearances, other
3
4
    court-ordered obligations, or essential activities that are
   pre-approved by the Pretrial Services officer. Please note I
5
6
    said pre-approved, and essential activities include things like
7
    haircuts, going to the DMV, going to the bank, other things
    that cannot be done by someone else on your behalf.
8
```

You must participate in a program of medical or psychiatric treatment, including treatment for drug or alcohol dependency as approved by your Pretrial Services officer, and you must pay all or part of the costs of such counseling services based on your ability to pay as determined by the Pretrial Services officer.

And during the pendency of this case, you must not enter any state or federal park, forest, or other public land without prior approval from the Court.

I've already advised you of the consequences of violating any of those terms of release.

Anything further, Mr. Anderson?

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, two things. First, could we have an additional condition that he not possess any matches, lighters, or other fire-starting device or equipment?

And then the second is, could I ask that this be stayed for

at least a week so that I can appeal it to the district judge?

```
THE COURT: I was expecting that.
 1
               MR. ANDERSON: Respectfully, of course.
 2
               THE COURT: Of course. I will first add an
 3
 4
     additional condition that will be number 16, that you shall not
     have in your possession matches, lighters, or any other
 5
     fire-starting device or equipment.
 6
 7
         And I am granting the government's request for a stay for
     seven days.
 8
         What this means, Mr. Maynard, is that they are appealing my
 9
10
     decision, which they have every right to do. So even though I
11
     told you you would be released at Monday morning at 9:00, that
     will not happen because they have a week to file an appeal and
12
13
     have a United States district judge review my decision.
14
         Should the district judge affirm my ruling, you will then
15
     be released on the next business day following that decision,
     and your obligation to report to Pretrial Services kicks in the
16
17
     day you are released.
18
         If the district judge overturns my decision, then you stay
19
     in jail.
         Ms. Labaree, anything else from the defense?
20
               MS. LABAREE: Not at this time, no.
21
22
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you all very much, and
23
     good luck to all.
24
               MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
```